

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
0970000, 243	03/30/98	UKAMURA	H UKAMURA-2B

001444 HM11/0824

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
624 NINTH STREET, NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON DC 20001-5303

EXAMINER

FITZGERALD, D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
164	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Offic**

Address: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

09/050,249

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER

15

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

David Fitzgerald (PTO)

Allen Yun (agent)

Date of interview: **17 August 2000** Type: Telephone/fax Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative)Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes No Attachment(s): Yes No

If yes for either, brief description:

Agreement was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question was not reached.

Claims discussed: Identification of prior art discussed:

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant proposed a set of monoclonal antibody claims largely similar to claims originally proposed by the examiner (see ¶ 3 of Paper No. 10) and to claims 59 *et seq.* as presented in Paper No. 9. The proposed claims differed from the former by the omission of any limitation requiring structural identity to a "mouse-identical" IGIF polypeptide. The examiner did not consider that such claims would be free of the outstanding ground of rejection under the description requirement of § 112.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 enumerated in M.P.E.P. § 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections, and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.